Case 1:11-cr-01091-VM Document 678 Filed 03/20/14 Page 1 of 23 1

	E2LBLESS	Sentence	Ü					
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT							
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF N							
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERI	CA,						
4	V •		11 CR 1091					
5	PETER J. LESNIEWSKI,							
6	Defenda	nt.						
7		x						
8			New York, N.Y. February 21, 2014					
9			11:37 a.m.					
10	Before:							
11	HON. VICTOR MARRERO,							
13			District Judge					
14		APPEARANCES						
15	PREET BHARARA							
16	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York							
17	DANIEL TEHRANI NICOLE FRIEDLANDER							
18	Assistant United	States Attorneys						
19	DURKIN & ROBERTS Attorneys for Def	endant						
20	THOMAS ANTHONY DURKIN							
21	JOSHUA L. DRATEL, P.C. Attorneys for Def LINDSAY A. LEWIS	endant						
22	HINDSAI A. HEWIS							
23								
24								
25								

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(In open court)

THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated. This is a proceeding in the matter of *United States v. Lesniewski*.

It's docket number 11 CR 1091. And we'll schedule as the set defendant in this matter.

Counsel, please enter your appearances for the record.

MR. TEHRANI: Good morning, your Honor. Daniel Tehrani and Nicole Friedlander for the government.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. DURKIN: Good morning, Judge. Tom Durkin and Lindsay Lewis on behalf of Dr. Lesniewski, who's present.

THE COURT: Good morning. The Court notes that the defendant is present in the courtroom seated next to his attorneys.

I have read and reviewed the presentence investigation report dated December 5, 2013, prepared in connection with today's sentencing of Dr. Lesniewski. I have also read the memorandum from defense counsel dated February 14th, 2014, and the memorandum from the government dated February 20, 2014.

Mr. Tehrani, has the government read and reviewed the presentence report?

MR. TEHRANI: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the government have any objections to the report to raise at this point?

(212) 805-0300

MR. TEHRANI: No, your Honor.

1	THI	E COURT:	Thank y	ou.				
2	Mr	Durkin,	have yo	u read	and	reviewed	the	presentence

3 report?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DURKIN: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Have you had an opportunity to discuss it with Dr. Lesniewski?

MR. DURKIN: We have.

THE COURT: Do you have any objections to the report that you wish to raise at this point?

MR. DURKIN: Nothing other than what we previously filed, Judge, which is attached to our sentencing submission. I think probation responded to it and we have nothing further on that.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I'll ask Dr. Lesniewski to please rise.

Have you read and reviewed the presentence report?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you had an opportunity to discuss it with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you. You may be seated.

On August 6, 2013, Dr. Lesniewski was found quilty by a jury verdict of Counts One, Three, Seven, Eight, Nineteen, Twenty, Twenty-two, Twenty-six, Twenty-seven and Thirty of Indictment No. 11 Cr. 1091, which charged him with conspiracy

to commit mail fraud, wire fraud, and health care fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1349, a Class C felony; conspiracy to defraud the United States Railroad Retirement Board in violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 371, a Class D felony; health care fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1347, a Class C felony; and mail fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. 1341, a Class C felony.

Mr. Tehrani, does the government have any additional comments for the Court's consideration in connection with sentencing?

MR. TEHRANI: Your Honor, just very briefly. As the trial evidence in this case showed, Dr. Lesniewski and the other disability doctors in this case were the linchpins of a massive disability fraud at the Long Island Railroad. The losses attributable to Dr. Lesniewski alone were nearly \$100 million. And without the participation of Dr. Lesniewski and other corrupt doctors, who were willing to subvert their medical licenses in the cause of fraud, a fraud of this type, a fraud of this scale, simply could not exist.

And for those reasons, your Honor, and for the reasons set out in much more length in the government's submission, the government respectfully believes that a guidelines sentence is appropriate in this case.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Durkin, do you have any additional comments for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Court's consideration in connection with sentencing?

MR. DURKIN: Judge, I have one housekeeping matter that Ms. Lewis could address regarding the financials. We have them and we've sent a copy to probation.

MS. LEWIS: Your Honor, I just wanted to let you know that we prepared the financial affidavits that are typically required as part of the PSR, although at the time we did note that it would probably take us considerably longer than usual to prepare them. And we actually did so after receiving the final PSR.

And so in light of that, we don't expect that they would be incorporated into the PSR in any way unless of course the Court wanted them to be. So we just have a copy here for the Court today as a courtesy if the Court does want them and, also, we have e-mailed a copy to probation. I've also reached out to probation, to Mr. Kapitansky asking whether he would like a copy by hand -- there are about 35 exhibits to this -and have not heard back. So I'm prepared to provide that.

But for today we were just providing them here, if the Court wants them, and not with any expectation that they'll factor into sentencing in any way beyond that.

THE COURT: Thank you.

The Court will direct that the materials be included as part of the record of this proceeding.

> Thank you, Judge. And we're not MR. DURKIN:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

suggesting we change anything.

THE COURT: Fine.

MR. DURKIN: Judge, I have a couple of comments, First, there are 16 people here that wrote letters. They are seated here. I can introduce them to you individually. They are willing to testify if you wanted them to, but I don't imagine there will be any --

THE COURT: If the letters are already in the record, the Court has considered them.

> MR. DURKIN: Yes. Thank vou.

I did not get a chance to respond to the government's filing, and I'm not complaining about that. There was a bit of a mixup. We delivered a copy to Mr. Weddle. It turned out Mr. Weddle was out of town. So in fairness to Ms. Friedlander and Mr. Tehrani, they didn't get it until Tuesday. So I'm not complaining in any way. We addressed it to Mr. Weddle and we forgot to put their names on it. I don't know whether it would have gotten there anyway because it would have gone to Weddle first.

I made the suggestion that I thought from a proportionality standpoint, my recommendation of two and a half years, which I know is far from the guidelines, did make certain sense. The government says it doesn't make any sense. But it seemed to me they had two arguments for that. that Dr. Ajemian had accepted responsibility, which I would

only note the government took a different position in in its pleadings. And I think the Court itself commented on it in your sentencing comments.

I would only refer the Court to the government's sentencing memorandum in the Ajemian case, pages, 17, 20, and 14, where they essentially argued that he was blaming the victims and not accepting responsibility. And your Honor pointed that out in your sentencing comments. And I don't say this to disparage Dr. Ajemian or anyone else, but I believe that there may well be a significant difference between somebody who simply exercises his due process right to go to trial — as you know, we put on no evidence. We did not challenge it. We're accepting of the verdict and we are not taking any positions contrary.

Dr. Ajemian accepted responsibility. Maybe he did, maybe he didn't. That's not my point. But my point is I think there is, from a proportionality standpoint and from the standpoint of individual sentencing, I think the suggestion that I make to you, that if 46 percent of this fraud, which the government argued for Dr. Ajemian was almost half of the fraud, merits eight years, then I think there is some substance to the suggestion that Dr. Lesniewski's sentence of 30 months, as I've suggested, is not unreasonable, or something close to that.

I think there should be some proportionality and I

think the individualized factors should make a difference. And I certainly don't think — and I certainly trust that your Honor won't hold it against him for going to trial. I understand that that raises our guideline level, but nonetheless we're still talking about 3553(a).

The second point the government argued is that somehow you heard the trial evidence. And while I understand you heard the trial evidence, I think that the trial evidence— and that's why I submitted two exhibits. The government's percentage exhibit, but I also significantly pointed out to you, and I think it's significant, that this was not Dr. Lesniewski's sole practice.

And that's not to deprecate the seriousness of the offense in any way, shape or form. And I hope I made that clear throughout my pleading. I'm only talking in mitigation. I'm not talking in any way that this isn't serious or that the doctor doesn't bear a certain responsibility based on the verdict. There's no question about that. We're not fighting that.

But what I'm suggesting is that if you take all the 3553(a) factors and you combine it with the, I think, relatively small portion of money that he was receiving, which is set forth— and I know your Honor paid careful attention to it at trial because we had so many arguments over it, defendant Exhibit L24. But if you compare \$286,000 to \$4,391,000, that's

an awfully small percentage.

And, again, it's not to deprecate the seriousness of the offense, but Dr. Lesniewski did have more than just the Long Island Railroad practice. He had a substantial surgery practice. I know the government quarrels with that, over the malpractice insurance issue, but we've argued that to you and I don't think we need to revisit that again today. You've heard all the evidence. There's no doubt this is a serious offense. No doubt punishment is in order. No doubt a prison sentence is in order.

But the real question becomes: What do we do proportionately and comparatively in a scheme like this where there's various different levels of participation? And what do you do to a man who's 63 years old, has some health problems. They're not debilitating, but I think to suggest that 30 months even would be a slight sentence is inaccurate as far as I'm concerned. I always count three Christmases away from your family when you're 63 years old is significant punishment.

I understand there's deterrents. There's general deterrents and there's individual deterrents. I certainly don't think that in any way, shape or form a sentence of close to three years would be a sentence that wouldn't deter. I don't think there's anybody out there that's going to start calculating and decide, well, you know, I'm going to participate in this type of fraud just for the sake of if I

mercy.

only get three years versus six or eight or whatever.

So with that, Judge, I would simply ask you to temper your sentence with mercy. You gave us— I know how carefully you followed this trial. I think you saw the evidence.

Dr. Lesniewski has great respect for you, for the Court, and we accept the verdict and he will accept your sentence. He's a man of great faith, as all the letters indicate. He will accept your sentence. I would simply ask you to temper it with

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Dr. Lesniewski, please rise. Is there anything you would like to say on your behalf before the Court imposes sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: No at this time, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you. You may be seated.

In accordance with the decision by the United States
Supreme Court in the United States v. Booker, while the United
States Sentencing Guidelines are not mandatory, the Court
nonetheless must consult those guidelines and take them into
account while sentencing. Therefore, this Court has considered
the findings of fact stated in the presentence report, as well
as the guidelines analysis and recommendations contained
therein. The Court has weighed this information along with the
factors listed in 18, United States Code, 3553(a) in coming to

its final sentencing decision.

The Court adopts the factual recitation in the presentence investigation report. Therefore, the Court finds that under the guidelines, Dr. Lesniewski's offense level amounts to 33 and his criminal history falls into category 1. The recommended range of imprisonment for that offense level and criminal history category is 135 to 168 months' imprisonment.

Dr. Lesniewski was found guilty of conspiracy to commit mail fraud, wire fraud, and health care fraud, conspiracy to defraud the United States Railroad Retirement Board, health care fraud and mail fraud. The probation office has recommended that the Court impose a sentence of 135 months on Counts One, Twenty-six, Twenty-seven and Thirty to be served concurrently.

Subsection (A)(1) of 18 U.S.C. 3553 requires that courts take into consideration the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant. Subsection (A)(2) of 18 U.S.C. Section 3553 requires that the Court consider the need for the sentence to promote certain objectives of the criminal justice system, namely: Punishment, specific and general deterrence, and rehabilitation. Pursuant to Section 3553(a)(6), the Court is also directed to consider the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities among defendants with similar records

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and similar offenses in other cases, as well as in connection with the case at hand.

Dr. Lesniewski, please rise.

Taking into account the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant, and the Court finds that a sentence of 96 months' imprisonment is reasonable and appropriate, in that such terms are sufficient, but not greater than necessary to promote the proper objectives of sentencing.

In imposing this sentence, I have taken into account the defendant's post-arrest rehabilitation; the relative roles of this defendant in relation to that of Dr. Ajemian and Mr. Rutigliano; the loss amounts that are involved which, to some extent in cases such as this, may be either imprecise or difficult to apportion among different defendants. I've taken into account the record of good works of the defendant as set forth by those who have written in his support and the defendant's age.

I've also taken into account the sentences that the Court imposed upon Dr. Ajemian and Mr. Rutigliano. Dr. Ajemian did not go to trial. He accepted responsibility, but in relation to the extent of the offense, the trial record indicated that Dr. Ajemian had a much more extensive practice in this fraud than did Dr. Lesniewski.

Dr. Ajemian was sentenced to 96 months.

Mr. Rutigliano, who similarly went to trial, was sentenced to 96 months. It is the Court's view that, taking into account all of the personal circumstances, the unique roles of each of these individuals in the offense, the loss amounts that were attributable to their individual participations would not warrant any disparity in the sentences among them.

I believe, Mr. Durkin, that a 30-month sentence, as you proposed, would be an unwarranted disparity with the sentences that the Court has imposed on defendants who the Court believes are similarly situated in many ways to that of Dr. Lesniewski. It would not be equitable under these circumstances to sentence Dr. Ajemian and Mr. Rutigliano to 96 months and Dr. Lesniewski, as you suggest, to a term of 30 months.

Upon your release from imprisonment, Dr. Lesniewski, you shall be placed on supervised release for a term of three years. I will indicate that the sentence of 96 months is on all of the counts, each of the counts to run concurrently.

The PSR recommends imposition of a fine of \$25,000. I will not impose a fine in light of the defendant's substantial restitution and other financial obligations that are involved in this case.

The restitution amounts, according to the government's calculation, shall be paid to the United States District Court, the Clerk of the Court for this district, for disbursement to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the following victims in the amounts stated: Railroad Retirement Board Disability Benefits, \$68,131,127; Railroad Retirement Board Sickness Benefits, \$1,301,564; AFLAC, \$792,047; UNUM, \$111,767; United Healthcare, \$296,395, for a total of \$70,632,900.

MR. DURKIN: Judge, would you repeat the last figure again?

> THE COURT: The total amount is \$70,632,900. (Pause)

THE COURT: Let me come back for a correction. Count Three, which is defrauding the Railroad Retirement Board, carries a maximum of five years. So the Court will impose a sentence on that count of a five-year maximum, again to run concurrently with the others.

Dr. Lesniewski, you're also ordered to pay to the United States a special assessment which is mandatory and which shall be due immediately of \$1,000.

Mr. Tehrani, is there a forfeiture in this case in addition to the restitution?

MR. TEHRANI: Yes, your Honor. We don't have an order to give you now. We will, of course, provide one shortly. But we ask for forfeiture in the amount of \$70,947,699. And the basis for that is set forth in Exhibit A of our sentencing submission.

THE COURT: All right.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Judge, we will make no further objection MR. DURKIN: than what we did in our objection to the PSR.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. DURKIN: We would object.

THE COURT: The Court will order that there be forfeiture in the amounts indicated in the forfeiture order which the government will submit and the Court will endorse.

MR. DURKIN: And the Court will at least note our objection on that.

THE COURT: The Court will note the objections of the defendants.

MR. DURKIN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Dr. Lesniewski, you must comply with standard conditions 1 through 13 of supervised release and the following mandatory conditions: You shall not commit another federal, state or local crime; you shall not illegally possess a controlled substance; you shall not possess a firearm or destructive device; you shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer.

The mandatory drug testing condition is suspended based on the Court's determination that you pose a low risk of future substance abuse.

In addition, you shall obey the following special conditions: You shall provide the probation officer with access to any requests for financial information; you shall not

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

incur any new credit card charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer unless you're in compliance with the installment payment schedule.

Dr. Lesniewski, do you understand each of those conditions?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: You shall report to the nearest probation office within 74 hours from release of custody.

The Court recommends that you be supervised by the district of residence.

The sentence as stated is imposed.

Dr. Lesniewski, to the extent that you have a right to appeal your sentence and you are unable to pay the cost of an appeal, you have the right to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis, meaning as a poor person. If you make such a request, the clerk of the court must immediately prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

Do you understand your right to appeal to the extent that it may exist?

> THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Tehrani, is there anything else-first, are there any remaining counts or underlying indictments that need to be dismissed at this time?

MR. TEHRANI: Yes. The government moves now to dismiss all open counts against Dr. Lesniewski.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: It will be so ordered.

Anything else from the government?

MR. TEHRANI: Yes, your Honor. Just on the latest objection. Mr. Durkin has relied on objections previously submitted to the Court. And in adopting the guidelines set forth in the PSR as well as adopting or setting restitution of forfeiture amounts, we just wanted to clarify for the record -- or inquire of your Honor for the record that you are-- just to confirm that you're denying those objections and adopting the numbers in the PSR as set forth in the government's submissions for the reasons set forth by both probation and the government.

THE COURT: In adopting the PSR, I made an implicit finding that those amounts are approved and the defense objections denied.

MR. TEHRANI: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. DURKIN: Judge, a couple of matters, Judge.

THE COURT: Can you propose a self-surrender date?

MR. DURKIN: Judge, I did. I spoke to the prosecutors about it. I understand it's normally about 90 days, but we have a special request that I don't believe the government has an objection to. Dr. Lesniewski has a daughter in Australia She had hoped to be here today and to see her who is pregnant. father before he surrenders, but she's had some serious

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

complications with the pregnancy.

And I believe-- I don't believe. I have letters from her doctors saying she's not permitted to travel whatsoever. I think she's due to deliver towards the end of June. discussed with the government if we could have a surrender date towards the last part of July, and I believe that's acceptable to the government.

THE COURT: Mr. Tehrani?

MR. TEHRANI: No objection, your Honor.

MR. DURKIN: Judge, we would also request that you make a recommendation for Otisville, New York.

THE COURT: The Court will so recommend.

Do we have a date in July?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: July 29th?

MR. DURKIN: What day of the week is that?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Tuesday.

MR. DURKIN: That should be fine. That's fine. Thank you.

THE COURT: Dr. Lesniewski, you're ordered to report to the facility designated by the United States Bureau of Prisons by noon on July 29th, 2014. If no facility has been designate by the BOP on that date, you are directed to report on that date by noon to the United States Marshal for this district. Your failure to do so will subject you to prosecution for offenses separate and apart from those for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

which you've been sentenced today, and the punishment can be severe.

Do you understand this?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You shall remain out on bail under the same terms and conditions that apply to date. Again, any violation of the conditions of bail can be to severe consequences.

Do you understand this?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

MR. DURKIN: Judge, there's one issue with the conditions as they exist right now. And I forgot to mention this to the government, but we have had discussions earlier. Dr. Lesniewski -- his wife has a condition of the bail. She's a co-signer. And she represented that she would make no transfers without us talking to the government.

The government had made an exception for legal fees and they said as long as we notified them. There will need to be more legal fees for the appeal. I'd like to avoid having to file a motion on that if it's possible. I don't know if the government has a position.

THE COURT: Mr. Tehrani?

MR. TEHRANI: Your Honor, I'm not sure this has to be resolved right now. I think we'd like to be able to talk to defense counsel about it, discuss it internally. And to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

extent that there's anything that your Honor then has to address, it can be brought to your Honor's attention at that point.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. DURKIN: That's fine. As long as I don't have to come here to --

THE COURT: No, there's no need to initiate a proceeding here. Just work it out with the government. If you can come to an accord, the Court will grant that due consideration and deference.

> MR. DURKIN: That's fine. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Have a good day and have a good weekend.

MR. TEHRANI: Your Honor, before we adjourn, there is a pending motion -- motion for bail pending appeal. I don't know if you wanted to address that today or you wanted the parties to be heard on that or how you wanted to address it.

MR. DURKIN: I don't think the government's had a chance to respond yet Judge. It's fine with me if you want to --

THE COURT: If you want to respond. But, Mr. Durkin, the Court had denied similar requests from other defendants, particularly Mr. Rutigliano.

MR. DURKIN: No, I understand.

THE COURT: What I did do in that case, as I've done here, is allow a sufficient period of time between now and self-surrender that you can pursue whatever applications you deem appropriate at the appellate level. If the appeals court gives you appeal, release during appeal, that's fine. I think that's equitable treatment.

MR. DURKIN: The only reason I would ask, if you would just at least entertain a government response, we did cite a different case. There was a recent— and this motion was drafted by appellate counsel John Klein of San Francisco, Judge. And he's going to do the appeal. And there's a case that he had cited that I don't believe was raised in the pleadings. It's a Second Circuit case that is now pending, a petition for rehearing. But it does affect the venue counts.

I'd only like to-- I'd just ask that you-- if the government wants to respond, I'd like you to just consider it because I don't think it's an argument that Mr. Rutigliano, Mr. Ryan addressed. I don't think so. I could be mistaken, but I don't think he did.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Tehrani.

MR. TEHRANI: Your Honor, a couple of things on that. We're happy to be heard on the merits today if you'd like to. I would note, though, a couple of things. One is it's, frankly, unclear whether this argument has been preserved by

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this particular defendant. But, more importantly, this was the precise argument that Mr. Rutigliano made in his motion for bail pending appeal. It was the motion that was denied and it's now the motion that's currently pending before the Court of Appeals.

I'd also note that Judge Wood, also in a related case involving Long Island Railroad employees, denied a Rule 33 motion, again based exactly on this case.

So, again, we're happy to argue it if it would be helpful for your Honor, but this is the motion that was previously denied by Mr. Rutigliano.

MR. DURKIN: If that's the case, then I don't want to --

THE COURT: All right. Let me call to your attention, Mr. Durkin, my understanding from Mr. Rutigliano, his counsel, Mr. Ryan, is that they expect to hear something, I don't know exactly what, from the Court of Appeals on their request by, I believe, March 12th.

> MR. DURKIN: Okay. That's fine.

THE COURT: Presumably if the arguments are the same and Mr. Rutigliano prevails there, then I think you would have a perfect right to come back and says "me too." If, on the other hand, the arguments are the same and he loses the case, then that gives you a sense of what you might reasonably expect here.

Case 1:11-cr-01091-VM Document 678 Filed 03/20/14 Page 23 of 23

E2LBLESS Sentence All right. Thank you. MR. DURKIN: Thank you. MR. TEHRANI: Thank you, your Honor. MS. FRIEDLANDER: Thank you. (Adjourned)